



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in truth not our own prayer at all, but might be the prayer of a man placed in utterly different conditions; and secondly, we do not really lay ourselves before the God who would be sought of us as our Helper and Saviour; we rather imagine a God who has a kind of love for the human ideal, but has no sympathy for our needs.

Obviously, if our religion is to be conterminous with our life and permeate the whole of it, we simply cannot put all our common life out of touch with God. We are not, therefore, to limit prayer to what we ourselves see that it is possible for God to do. Even in our human relations it would be a foolish child that would so limit his requests of his father. We are not very wise at

best as to the possibilities in this universe of ours, and we need not be afraid of embarrassing God.

On the other hand, there is obviously a great possible abuse of prayer in pressing purely temporal requests with God. No personal relation can bear a dominant selfish interest in the *things* which the friendship may bring. It will surely not be less true in our relation to God that we shall utterly spoil the relation if we think of it as primarily a means to temporal results. God is no mere reservoir of good things, nor is prayer an infallible way of obtaining them. As Trumbull long ago insisted, what men need is faith in God rather than "faith in prayer."

AESCHYLUS AND THE EIGHTH-CENTURY PROPHETS

HENRY THATCHER FOWLER, PH.D.

Professor of Biblical Literature and History in Brown University, Providence

Since we have begun to treat the writings of ancient Israel as genuine literature growing out of the experience of the people and expressing their interpretation of life, very little attempt has been made to appreciate the Hebrew or Greek through any detailed comparison of the one with the other. It has indeed been noted that "true historical literature had a wholly independent origin only among the Israelites and Greeks,"¹ but a detailed comparison of the rise and significance of historical writing in

the two has not, I think, been undertaken. Nor, as far as I am aware, has a thorough comparative study as yet been made of the lyric poetry of these two, who are almost as unique in the ancient world through the worth of their song as through the originality of their recording of history.

In other departments of composition each people made highly distinctive contributions to the world's literature. Hebrew prophecy and Greek drama may stand as supreme representatives.

¹ Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*.

In the present study we shall consider and compare only the earliest extant examples of these two characteristic types of literature, first in respect of form and then in respect of thought.

One is always embarrassed in any attempt to discuss and evaluate Hebrew writings from a literary point of view, and one is always in danger of underestimating them. In these matters we are children of the Greeks; our categories, standards, terminology are Greek. One might almost as well try to describe and appreciate the architecture of St. Mark's in terms of the three orders as to discuss some examples of Semitic poetry in the only terms we possess.

In Greek life prophecy played a considerable part, and Greek writers reflect its influence in various ways. Oracles early took permanent form, but prophecy hardly constituted a separate class of literature; it remained rudimentary even in its splendid imaginative treatment in Cassandra's utterance before the house of Agamemnon or in its elaboration in Sibylline oracles. The earliest prophets of Israel were kin of those of Hellas and other lands. They cultivated frenzy; they divined for a piece of silver or a king's favor; they exercised their wits on oracular verses, telling the fates of tribes and peoples, finding hidden meanings in names, exhibiting the efficacy of a parental curse or blessing. Prophets of this type continued till a late date in the nation's history; but there developed out of this crude body a goodly number of individuals who were freed almost wholly from the primitive practices of their order, and who have left us a group of writings that constitutes Israel's supreme distinctive contribution.

Prophecy came to a sudden out-flowering in the middle and latter half of the eighth century before Christ, producing a kind of literature so different from any that we know earlier in Israel, so different from any that we find among other peoples, that we must recognize it as a separate form in world-literature. Like the classical drama, it is a distinct creation, though composed of elements whose general character is familiar enough. The drama is commonly described as made up of lyric and narrative poetry, and dialogue, all associated with the primitive marching and dancing of the Dionysiac chorus. Despite its composite character, the term Greek drama calls up a distinct concept. To most, "Hebrew prophecy" fails to suggest a well-defined notion of a composite literary form. Perhaps this form can never be as clearly conceived. The composite drama became more symmetrical and stereotyped than the composite prophecy. Hebrew literary modes, like the pattern of an oriental rug, suggest pleasing symmetry but hardly lend themselves to exact analysis.

The tiny product of the earliest "writing prophet" contains all the elements—rhetoric or oratory, a bit of lyric, and some narrative in both prose and verse. Amos' voice was hardly yet silent when Hosea followed with his slightly longer roll—lyric and rhetoric with some poetic narrative. While Hosea was still active in the Northern Kingdom, Isaiah began his long career in Jerusalem, and Micah was a younger contemporary of Isaiah. The structure of the original writings of all four is essentially the same, though the minor narrative element hardly appears in

Micah. This latter element might be prose or poetry. The rhetoric was commonly, if not always, in these earlier prophets, of poetic structure, yet it was genuine oratory of the most vital sort, no mere literary or stage rhetoric. The line between this and the more purely lyric elements may not be any more clearly traceable than it sometimes is between the different constituents of the drama. At times the prophet deliberately became a minstrel. Amos announced himself as about to sing a dirge, and the lines which immediately follow furnish a very exact specimen of elegiac meter:

Hear ye this word which I take up for a dirge over you, O house of Israel.

Fallen, no more shalt thou rise, virgin of Israel.

Forsaken she lieth prone, no one uplifting.

Isaiah's song of Yahweh's vineyard gives us our fullest indications of the character of Israel's early vintage songs, of whose existence we find some evidence in the Book of Psalms, and this is true even though Isaiah's song soon proves to be a parable and the lilting measure of the opening lines changes into the harsh notes of a song of doom. Canon Cheyne has reproduced the effect of the original quite remarkably in his translation beginning:

A song will I sing of my friend,
A love song touching his vineyard.

A vineyard belongs to my friend,
On a hill that is fruitful and sunny;
He digged it and cleared it of stones,
And planted there vines that are choice;
A tower he built in the midst,
And hewed also therein a wine vat;
And he looked to find grapes that are good,
Alas! it bore grapes that are wild.

The works on Greek literature are able to tell a reasonably full and clear story of the development of the drama: the oriental or semi-oriental dithyramb coming from Phrygia into Thrace; Arion producing his choral dithyrambs at the court of Periander in Corinth (about 600 B.C.); this chorus, performed by satyrs, coming to Athens during the brilliant reign of Pisistratus in the middle of the sixth century; Thesbis, separate from the chorus, reciting verses at the great Dionysia of 534; finally Aeschylus, in the first half of the next century, introducing two persons detached from the chorus and giving the world real drama. It all reads very smoothly despite some uncertainties as to details.

In Israel's literature the break between Amos and all that had gone before is much greater than that between Aeschylus and his predecessors. We have many stories about prophets, some of which reveal the true spiritual ancestors of Amos, but not his literary predecessors. Hebrew historical narrative came to perfection, relatively to other forms of composition, much earlier than Greek. In the narratives that antedate Amos, not only in the stories of Moses, Samuel, and Elijah, but in the documents as a whole, there is so much of the characteristic spirit and thought of Amos and his successors that we rightly style them prophetic histories. We have, too, examples of a variety of poetry from the centuries before Amos, ranging from primitive bits of folk-song, taunt-song, and oracular verse to artistic dirge and ode of victory. Amos himself pictured the prevalence of music and song among the wealthy dwellers at the nation's capital:

That lie upon beds of ivory,
 And stretch themselves upon their couches,
 That sing idle songs to the sound of the viol;
 That invent for themselves instruments of
 music, like David;
 That drink wine in bowls,
 And anoint themselves with the finest of oil.

All this is true, yet the prophetic book bursts suddenly upon us in the writing of Amos, and we cannot trace the steps by which the composite form took shape. Oracles in poetic form like those of Balaam, the curse of Noah, or the blessings of Jacob and Moses offer no close parallel. The stories of the prophets contain effective dialogue, but they afford even less of suggestion for the form of Amos' book, in which we find a symmetry of structure, a progress of thought, a sustained power of diction, and, at the same time, a freedom from the frenzied extravagance or prosaic stupidity of the few existing earlier oracles, all of which seems to argue a course of development now untraceable.

Amos appears at the royal sanctuary of Northern Israel when the victories of Jeroboam II have brought about a great expansion of territory and begins an address to the assembled people:

Yahweh from Zion shall roar,
 From Jerusalem utter his voice;
 The shepherd's pastures shall mourn,
 The crest of Carmel wither.

Thus sayeth Yahweh:
 For three transgressions of Damascus,
 Yea four, I will not revoke it;
 For their threshing with iron, Gilead.
 I will send a fire on Hazael's house,
 To devour Benhadad's palaces.
 I will cut off inhabitant from Aven-valley
 And holder of sceptre from Eden-house,
 And break Damascus' gate-bar;
 So Syrians shall go captive to Kir,
 Sayeth Yahweh.

We have no information as to the time or occasion of Amos' writing down of this and his other poetic orations. It may be that, as in the case of Cicero's orations, our carefully constructed address was not spoken in just the form in which it has come down to us; yet it may well be that it was thoroughly wrought out in advance.

One can select almost at random from Isaiah's oracles to exemplify his powers as poet-orator. Ability to suit sound to thought, to kindle feeling by sound as well as by thought, must have given his speech something of the emotive power of music superadded to that of oratory.

Ah!
 The booming of many peoples!
 Like the booming of seas they boom!
 And the roar of mighty nations!
 As with the roar of waters do they roar!

But [Yahweh] shall rebuke him,
 And he shall flee far away and be pursued,
 Like chaff of the mountains before the wind,
 And as the whirling dust before the tempest.

The translation reproduces something of the sound effect of the original. The roar of mighty nations, that roar as with the roar of waters, is *ûsheôn leúmmim, kishôn máyim kabîrîm yisha'ân*. With Yahweh's rebuke the figure changes to express the change in that figured. The armies are no longer rushing masses like mighty waters, but multitudes of driven individuals, like chaff before the wind of the hilltop threshing floor, like dust before the storm-wind. It is not now the booming of many people—*hamôn ammîm rabbîm*—but *mots lîphne-rûach, galgâl, lîphné suphâ*—chaff and dust.

It was the last and least of the eighth-century prophets, Micah, whose imagination presented in brief but majestic

drama the great court scene, when Yahweh called upon the mountains, the foundations of the earth, to hear his plea against his people:

O my people, what have I done unto thee?
And wherein have I wearied thee?
Testify against me.

He goes on to recall his bringing them from Egypt safely into the promised land. The people respond in deep penitence, questioning whether the burning of thousands of rams, the pouring out of myriads of rivers of oil, the sacrifice of the first-born son might expiate their guilt. Then the prophet speaks, interpreting as the chorus in the drama: "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Yahweh require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

A single generation thus saw a group of speakers and writers whose work exhibits rounded and sustained rhetorical periods, clear grasp of facts illumined by bold imagination, vivid word-pictures in which thought and sound combine in harmony, and even well-conceived dramatic bits.

Sir Richard Jebb writes of Aeschylus "whose lofty verse had been inspired by the wish to nourish the minds of his fellow-citizens with ennobling ideals, to make them good men and true, worthy of their fathers and their city." To me it seems that Aeschylus alone of the Attic dramatists has a majesty of poetic utterance like that of Israel's eighth-century prophets. Professor Lawton finds Aeschylus in spirit and thought kinsman of Isaiah, Dante, and Milton. In nobleness of poetic speech

the first dramatist and Isaiah seem no less kindred. Both are at home with the great and awe-awakening forces of nature. We think inevitably of the wonderful ending of the *Prometheus*. After the baffled Hermes has given his somewhat pettish warning, the tortured Titan left alone speaks:

Now his threats walk forth in action,
And the firm earth quakes indeed.
Deep and loud the ambient Thunder
Bellows, and the flaming Lightning
Wreathes his fiery curls around me,
And the whirlwind rolls his dust;
And the winds from rival regions
Rush in elemental strife,
And the Ocean's storm-vexed billows
Mingle with the startled stars!
Doubtless now the tyrant gathers
All his hoarded wrath to whelm me.
Mighty Mother, worshipped Themis
Circling Ether that diffusest
Light, a common joy to all.
Thou beholdest these my wrongs.

A wealth of imagery from nature is so characteristic of Israel's prophets that I have been led to note this aspect of Aeschylus writing rather carefully. It is not possible here to speak of details. In general, it seems to me true that in wealth and spontaneity of nature's symbols the early prophetic writers excel even the first dramatist. In the "Great Arraignment" forming the short first chapter of Isaiah's book, we enumerate some fifteen or sixteen distinct similes drawn from home and farm life, from industry, history, and nature; yet all are so perfect that they serve only to make the thought effective. Aeschylus, whose boyhood vision knew the beauty of that view out over Eleusis Bay to the blue mountains of Salamis, had

come under the charm of a nature far different, far more beautiful, perhaps, than any known to Isaiah near his Jerusalem home or to Amos on the barren, wind-swept mountain-top of Tekoa; yet there is a wonderful wealth of changing color and a kindling of imagination as one looks from the rocky summits of the Judean mountains over the desert-crested hilltops of the wilderness and across the great gorge to the wall of Moab. Its fascination is like that of the lonely ocean. Aeschylus growing to manhood amid the picture-beauty of Attica, and Isaiah and Amos in the face of the wilderness are far more kindred in their feeling of nature than Aeschylus and Hosea in whose poetry the softer influences of the smooth rounded hills and inviting valleys of Northern Israel are felt. Yet even Hosea was stranger to such charming beauty as that of the Aegean shore.

One might profitably compare with far more adequacy the modes of expression that reveal the poet natures of Hebrew prophet and Greek dramatist; but our present purpose is accomplished if we realize that these two literary forms, each characteristic of the life and spirit of the people that gave it birth, each full of the beauty and grandeur of the nature that domiciled that life—that these characteristic literary forms afforded instruments for the expression of life more comprehensive in their range than any simple form of prose or poetry. Neither pure narrative, prose or verse, nor philosophic or lyric speech is capable of expressing life with the varied richness of the Hebrew prophecy or the Greek drama.

II

And thus at length we are come to the second division of our subject. Some aspects of "the essentials of life in its greatness" as life was interpreted by the earliest dramatist and the earliest writing prophets. I borrow my phrase from Professor Woodberry's little book on *The Appreciation of Literature*. He writes: "One who has read the Hebrew prophets, the Greek dramatists, and Shakespeare has a view of the essentials of life in its greatness that requires little supplementing." In undertaking this study, it was not so much my purpose to note how the genius of each race developed a literary form capable of expressing the essentials, as it was to consider some of the aspects of life that are interpreted in these two groups of ancient writings.

First we may note that in origin and character both drama and prophecy are distinctly religious and ethical. Historians and critics, when speaking of the drama, never fail to remind us of its distinctly religious origin and associations; but I hardly find sufficient emphasis laid by them upon the fact that, although connected in its origin with the orgies of Dionysus-worship, in its Attic perfection that god has disappeared from tragedy almost as completely as the goatskin garments that gave the name. Zeus, mighty and just, Apollo the enlightener, occasionally Athena the wise—these are the deities whose presence is hardly less prominent in tragedy than Yahweh's in prophecy; and no one finds it necessary to remind us of the essentially religious character of prophecy. The Furies too are often present—representatives of what? Of an older

order disappearing before the enlightened rule of Zeus? Of nature's dread law of retribution unto many generations? Whatever their meaning, they are essential to the ancient poet's story of life in its complexity. If we were comparing the late Jewish literature, we might consider the function of the Erinyes in relation to that of Satan the adversary, personification of hostility to Yahweh's beneficent purposes or whatever he may be, but prophecy had run its course before Satan found standing place in Hebrew literature. This suggests the fact that prophecy does not deal with the puzzling problems of individual destiny, so prominent in tragedy and in some of Israel's later thought. It is only in connection with the nation's fall and exile that prophecy turns to the individual's standing before God, and true prophecy has ceased before the perplexing implications of this theme come to the fore. Problems of individual life at a certain stage of their interpretation seem to demand Erinyes or Satan for their solution.

The voices of the first writing prophet and the first dramatist are raised in times of great national prosperity and confidence. The destruction of Damascus followed by a generation of inactivity on Assyria's part had given Israel opportunity to recover from the devastation pictured in Amos' opening address and to make broad her boundaries as David had done two and a half centuries earlier. Sudden wealth had transformed society in the little state. The nation was self-confident, having taken to itself "horns of its own strength," yet not impiously unmindful of the deity and his ritual service. On a far more significant

scale military success had come to Greece when Aeschylus sang. Marathon and Salamis had been fought and won, and the poet himself had borne his part in these fateful struggles. In the *Seven against Thebes* he makes the chorus sing "for a state prospering honors the divinities"—common matter for observation no doubt in his day. So Amos found prosperous Israel making her burnt offerings, meal offerings, and thank offerings of fat beasts, and singing songs to Yahweh with the accompaniment of the viol's melody, observing too the sacred days with due cessation of business; besides, it would seem, not wholly ignoring the older divinities long established in the land. The religious practices of the festive worshipers at the royal sanctuary of Northern Israel, when the mountain shepherd of Judah suddenly raised his voice, suggest the early Dionysiac revels. These people thought of Yahweh as a tribal god who had shown his power and approval by giving the kingdom its recent expansion and unaccustomed wealth. Amos declared that Yahweh was concerned, not only with injustice done to their nation, but equally with Moab's impious cruelty to Edom, concerned, too, with the honesty and fairness of the methods by which his worshipers obtained the means for their abundant sacrifices; was interested, not simply in the merchant's Sabbath rest, but equally in his eagerness to be back at the week's trade in refuse wheat sold by false measure. Amos himself did not assert complete ethical monotheism, but he did make a longer step toward this than any other one man has ever taken. He looked beyond Damascus and saw in

distant Assyria, now long quiescent, God's instrument for punishing a people pock-marked by bribery in the law courts, dishonest weights and measures in business, wine suppers demanded by the newly rich women, licentiousness in worship, luxury everywhere won by dishonest and cruel oppression. When he declared that Israel's peculiar relation to Yahweh was ground of her greater condemnation under his just rule, he at least cut the main root of the moral evil inherent in the old Semitic henotheism.

In only one extant play, the *Persians*, does Aeschylus deal so directly with world-history and with the affairs of his own age. Here, interestingly enough, it is the shade of Darius called back who interprets the course of events as only the hastening through Xerxes' presumption of that which was divinely determined long since.

The prophets, we must remember, did not formulate a systematic theology, and, quite obviously, it is even more difficult to make general affirmations concerning the dramatists' beliefs. The prophets we find dealing, with however much of poetic dress and imagination, still immediately with the local and world events of their day. We have just noticed that when Aeschylus once takes up such a subject, he transfers his audience in imagination to distant Susa and puts his interpretation into the mouth of the departed organizer of the splendid Persian Empire. We may count the interpretation, however, as truly Greek, perhaps Aeschylus' own. He does not seem to have penetrated the Persian consciousness very deeply when he represents Queen Atossa and Darius calling the Persians always

βάρβαροι. Yet we must be on our guard, even in Aeschylus, against attributing all the sentiments uttered by the choruses and the different characters to the poet himself. It has been well noted that "in the case of a dramatic poet, we cannot determine a question of this kind by an enumeration of isolated sentiments"; we must rather have regard to the general drift of the teaching, as shown in the catastrophe of the plays, and formulated from time to time by those speakers who, like the chorus in the *Agamemnon* and Darius in the *Persians*, point the moral. Jebb warns us against supposing any definite and coherent system of doctrine in Aeschylus. He suggests that if the poet were examined on his views of the relations between fate and free will, modern criticism would possibly find his answers vague and unsatisfactory—far less ingenious too than the answers which moderns have devised on his behalf. So far as it is directly didactic, he holds that Attic tragedy in large part "consisted in clothing received Hellenic maxims with forms of new energy and beauty." Yet Jebb does not scruple to make positive generalization as to Aeschylus' fundamental theology, and we may seek, although with wary step, to find this writer's conception of the power that controls human events.

The *Prometheus* suggests absolute fatalism; Zeus himself cannot even learn what is to befall and Fate determines his sway. In this play, too, the newly victorious deity seems anything but just and beneficent—Κράτος and Βία, Strength and Force, are his worthy ministers. Altogether we seem nearer the stage of theological thinking represented

in the old Babylonian myths than in Amos. The splendor of the conception of the suffering Titan, whose spirit yields not to force, is to us the glory of the play. It is one of the most superb manifestations of the Greek soul, in comparison with which Sophocles' appeals for pious submission taste like milk and water, nine parts water. For Aeschylus' theology we cannot trust the *Prometheus* very far. We do not know the sequel in the *Prometheus Unbound*. The complete trilogy might solve the puzzle of the Zeus in this play, so foreign to Aeschylus' usual conception. We may hope for our love of the poet and the glory of the Greek race that Prometheus never yielded to torture-inflicting Strength and Force nor to the terror of "heaving earth, roaring echo of thunder, the deep blazing wreaths of lightning, the strife of conflict gusts, the firmament embroiled."

Whatever the solution in the *Prometheus*, in the plays as a whole we find Aeschylus reaching, in face of the sternest realities of life, toward faith in the full rule of a god who is rational and just, not blind fate or conquering force. If this be Hellenic theology before his time, then he nobly sets it forth. If it be an advance upon the faith of his predecessors, then he too is prophet. He seems to have the prophet's consciousness of standing alone.

But I, from others disagreeing.
And I alone with clear mind seeing.
Declare it is the impious deed
That others after it will breed
Renewing the parent in the seed.
Whereas in homes that honor Duty
Forever Fate
Doth propagate
A child of beauty.

Thus he makes the chorus sing in the *Agamemnon*. Whether or not Aeschylus took for his race a new step forward in the apprehension of the one God who rules justly, his writings reveal the struggle each must make for himself to solve the riddle of blind force, compassion, growing apprehension of spiritual values, all so bafflingly interwoven in life's web. How clearly this is read in the one complete trilogy! Even the *Prometheus* suggests something of a new and better order coming in the establishment of the rule of Zeus, but the *Oresteia* trilogy carries the story of retribution working out through generation after generation to its termination in the defeat of the Furies by Apollo and Athena. The Erinyes must still be recognized, appeased by honors in Athena's city itself, but the awful curse of relentless visitation unto endless generations, when the sin has ceased, is checked by the enlightened gods. At the close of the trilogy, all-seeing Zeus and Moira, goddess of Fate, descend together to the citizens of Pallas, and the cry is "Break forth into songs."

From Aeschylus' extant plays we are justified in affirming with Jebb that, though he is no monotheist, he might be described as a monarchist in religion, and with James Adam that, "in the dynasty of the gods to which Zeus belongs, there is but a single purpose, a single ruling will, the will of Zeus himself."

Zeus, who'er he be, this name
If it pleaseth him to claim,
This to him will I address;
Weighing all, no power I know
Save only Zeus, if I aside would throw
In sooth as vain this burthen of distress.

This ruling will is in harmony with justice; *Dika* is the most prominent attribute of Zeus in Aeschylus.

From Amos we have only a tiny pamphlet, a quarter or third as long as a single play of Aeschylus, and from the dramatist we have only seven of the scores of plays he wrote, yet each has left a sufficient revelation of himself for us to know them both as kindred souls. Men of rugged strength they are who stride forward all unknown each to other, yet breast to breast, each confident amid all life's wrong that Justice is with God. Zeus or Yahweh, who'er he be, this name If it pleaseth him to claim.

In the *Suppliants*, the chorus sings:
 Justly his deed was done,
 Unto to what other one
 Of all the gods, should I for justice turn?
 From him our race did spring;
 Creator he and king
 Ancient of days and wisdom he and might.
 As bark before the wind,
 So wafted by his mind,
 Moves every counsel, each desire aright.

Reference to the original shows this poetic version of Mr. Morshead rather free, influenced by Hebrew ideas and terms, yet it is really there in the original, only not in such Old Testament terms. "Ancient of days and wisdom" is all implied in *παλαιόφρων*.

With both Amos and Aeschylus justice is predominantly punitive. "Therefore will I visit upon you all your iniquities," cries Amos, and Aeschylus finds no bulwark against destruction for the man who in the wantonness of his heart has spurned the great altar of Justice. In treating of sin that demands just retribution, Amos and Aeschylus are dealing commonly with very differ-

ent aspects of conduct. In his scorn of the "rich man's house . . . where hands with lucre are foul," the dramatist suggests the prophet's denunciations, but usually he does not apply his doctrine of justice in detail to the social and economic evils of his day.

Isaiah here offers closer parallel. His distinctive contribution to the prophetic conception of God is exaltation, separation from humanity's contamination, unapproachable holiness. The correlative is judgment upon all that is high and lifted up, all that exalts itself. To Aeschylus too, *ὑβρις*, overweening pride or insolence, seems the very nature of sin.

The heart of the haughty delights to beget
 A haughty heart. From time to time
 In children's children recurrent appears

The ancestral crime.

When the dark hour comes that the gods
 have decreed,

And the Fury burns with wrathful fires
 A demon unholy, with ire unabated,
 Lies like black night on the halls of the fated:
 And the recreant son plunges guiltily on

To perfect the guilt of his sires.

But Justice shines in a lowly cell;
 In the houses of poverty, smoke-begrimed,
 With the sober minded she loves to dwell.

But she turns aside

From the rich man's house with averted eye,
 The golden fretted halls of pride
 Where hands with lucre are foul, and the
 praise

Of counterfeit goodness smoothly sways.

And wisely she guides in the strong man's
 despite

All things to an issue of right.

The *Persians* gives especial opportunity for emphasis upon *hubris*. Atossa, the queen-mother, is a model of resignation. After the long silence under "calamity too great for her to speak"

she asserts the necessity for "mortals to endure afflictions when the gods award them" and bids the messenger continue the tragic report from Salamis. The shade of Darius called forth declares Zeus a chastiser of overbearing thoughts. The calamity is, it is true, the consummation of ancient oracles whose fulfillment was to be expected, after a long issue, "but when man is himself speeding onward God also lends a hand." "My son not understanding hath brought it about by his youthful presumption; who unwisely thought that he should get the mastery of all the gods and of Poseidon:

For bursting into blossom, Insolence
Its harvest ear, Delusion, ripeneth
And reaps most tearful fruit."

Finally he urges that Xerxes be admonished that he may cease to insult the gods with his overweening confidence. In both Aeschylus and Isaiah, presumptuous sin is more, far more, than the primitive idea of trespass upon the prerogatives of the gods that we find in Herodotus or the Tower of Babel story.

The prophets of the great age raise no question of man's accountability for his conduct; they assume it. In the *Seven against Thebes*, Aeschylus gives a conception of a parental curse like the early Hebrew idea seen in the story of the curse of Noah or in the blessing of Isaac. Indeed he seems to show very much of the current thought of his people that the gods or fate decree the sin, so that man cannot avoid committing it. An insolent course is a kind of madness, the work of a *δαίμων* yet we find him reaching toward the thought of man's responsibility, at least for the first step

in sin. Perhaps it is true too, as has been affirmed, that he invariably makes the victim of ancestral guilt a sinner also on his own account.

Beyond the mere punitive interpretation of misfortune, Aeschylus shows at least flashes of insight into the significance of suffering: "To those who suffer justice brings understanding." One hardly knows what English word to use—understanding, knowledge born of experience, comprehension, something of that sort.

In the eighth-century prophets, Hosea stands forth as the one to whom Yahweh, not *Dika*, has brought understanding through suffering. This prophet's opening paragraph tells the story of one who loved his wife with a chivalrous, self-abnegating love that we know not where else to seek in pre-Christian literature. When she had borne in his house children of whoredom, when she had left him to follow her lovers, and then at length, deserted of them, had fallen into slavery, he loved her still and bought her back from her owners; not that he would possess the polluted one, but because he would provide for and shield her. She must abide long by him, not playing the harlot, not any man's wife, and so will he also be toward her. Through this suffering, Hosea realized that God had called him to pass and thus to learn truth never before comprehended by a son of man—even the knowledge that God's love cannot be changed to hate by man's indifference or flouting. "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? . . . I will not return to destroy: for I am God and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee; and I will not come in wrath." Hosea

believed not less definitely than Amos or Aeschylus that sin must bring judgment; he realized too, no less than Aeschylus, the teaching power of suffering; beyond both, he saw that the fires of suffering burn unto purification.

Should we pursue the comparison of drama and prophecy further, we should find much to consider on the significance of suffering in Sophocles and we should need to compare Aeschylus' thought of Prometheus suffering for his benefit to humanity with the supreme insight of the author of "The Suffering Servant."

To me these points that we have touched upon seem some of the essentials of life in its greatness to the consideration of which we are led in the early pages, whether we open the volume of Hebrew prophecy or Greek tragedy—the nature of the power that controls life, the tragedy of life with its inherited weight of woe, its blind impulse to deeds most loathed, its ignorance of God and right, the essence of sin and of right, the meaning of suffering, the true relation between man and man, man and God.

In his lecture upon "Japanese Religions," Dr. Nitobe, our first exchange professor from Nippon, pictured the different religions as paths leading toward the same mountain summit. Far apart at the first, they draw close together as they approach the top. Butcher, in his Harvard Lectures, characterized Greece and Israel as representing divergent impulses and tendencies of human nature and different ideals of perfection; yet how near they come when by their different and distant paths, drama and prophecy, they climb toward the summit and look up into calm heaven. To each is given some vision of Him who rules with justice. Cardinal Mercier has written: "Justice itself is only absolute because it is the expression of the essential concord of men with God and among themselves." Great seekers for this essential concord were the first dramatist of the nation that longed for perfect harmony in all realms and the first writing prophet of the nation that hungered and thirsted for the living God.

THE PERMANENT AND TRANSIENT ELEMENTS IN THE LIFE OF JESUS

RAY O. MILLER, M.A., B.D.

Rector, Church of the Saviour, Hanford, California

To some the Christian life is simply imitative. There were no elements of a transient nature in Him, nor is any event in his life, however insignificant,

to be slurred over. The incident of feet-washing is as permanent as baptism; the apocalyptic visions are as valuable as the Sermon on the Mount; and incidental